

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 2, 4, 5-7, and 9-11 are cancelled, claims 1, 3, 8, and 12 remain in this application as amended herein, and claims 13-20 are added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3, 8, and 12-20 are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 8, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander (U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931) in view of Killian (U.S. Patent No. 7,163,316). Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of the references.

Independent claims 1 and 3 have been amended to more clearly show the differences between the claimed features and the relied on art. No new matter has been added by these changes. Support for these changes is found at, e.g., Figs. 11, 16, and 18-19 and the corresponding pages of the specification.

As amended herein, claim 1 recites:

a receiving unit operable to receive program signals and first program guide information, the first program guide information including broadcasting time information of a program;

a production unit operable to produce second program guide information from the first program guide information, the second program guide information including the broadcasting time information of the program for every time slot spanned by the program;

an allocation unit operable to allocate the second program guide information as one or more clone EPG objects in a retrieval table for retrieval based upon the time slots spanned by the program, wherein each of the clone EPG objects is allocated to a single one of the time slots spanned by the program by directly copying the first program guide information of the program as the clone EPG objects and then setting each clone EPG object to a respective one of the time slots spanned by the program;

a retrieval unit employing a given one of the time slots as a search condition to set retrieval processing, the retrieval unit being operable to retrieve a respective one of the clone EPG objects for the second program guide information from the retrieval table using the given time slot as the search condition to identify the respective clone EPG object for the program,

wherein a program table for displaying information of the program to a user is generated based on the respective clone EPG object[.]

Neither the relied on sections of Alexander nor the relied on sections of Killian disclose or suggest the features set out in the above excerpt of claim 1.

It follows, for at least the above reasons, that neither the relied-on sections of Alexander nor the relied-on sections of Killian, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the receiver defined in claim 1, and claim 1 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the relied-on art.

Independent claim 3 calls for features similar to those set out in the above excerpt of claim 1. Therefore, claim 3 is patentably distinct and unobvious over the relied-on sections of Alexander and Killian at least for the same reasons.

Claim 8 depends from claim 1, and claim 12 depends from claim 3. Therefore, claims 8 and 12 are each distinguishable over the relied-on references for at least the same reasons as its parent claim.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

New claims 13-16 depend from claim 1, and new claims 17-20 depend from claim 3. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over the relied on art for at least the same reasons. Support for new claims 13-20 is found at, e.g., Figs. 11, 16, and 18-19 and the corresponding pages of the specification.

Application No.: 10/021,495

Docket No.: SONYAK 3.3-033 DIV

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: May 4, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

981829_1.DOC